

States of Pennsylvania, Texas, and Michigan of quantities of oil of eucalyptus and oil of sandalwood which were adulterated and misbranded.

The oil of eucalyptus was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, namely, "Oil of Eucalyptus"; but its strength, quality, and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold since its congealing point fell below 15.4° Centigrade and its own standard of strength, quality, and purity was not stated on the label. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Oil Eucalyptus * * * U. S. P.," borne on the label, was false and misleading since it represented that the article was oil of eucalyptus of U. S. P. standard; whereas it fell below such standard.

The oil of sandalwood was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia but differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in the pharmacopoeia for sandalwood oil; and fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold but its own standard of strength, quality, and purity was not stated on the label. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Oil Sandalwood E. I. U. S. P.," borne on the can label, was false and misleading since it represented that the article was East Indian sandalwood oil of pharmacopoeial standard; whereas it fell below such standard. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the name of another article, namely, "Oil Sandalwood * * * U. S. P."

On November 8, 1940, pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed fines totaling \$600.

31130. Misbranding of Superchlor Klo-Rid. U. S. v. Patterson Laboratories, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 42796. Sample No. 55863-D.)

The labeling of this product bore false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims for both human and veterinary use.

On April 25, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan filed an information against the Patterson Laboratories, Inc., Detroit, Mich., alleging shipment on or about June 8, 1939, from the State of Michigan into the State of Indiana, of a quantity of Superchlor Klo-Rid which was misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article was a solution containing not more than 2.37 percent of sodium hypochlorite.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling, regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a preventative and in the elimination or spread of contagious or infectious diseases; effective to disinfect open wounds, sore itching feet, skin irritations from poison ivy, rusty nail, insect or animal bite, athlete's foot, ringworm, ingrown toe nail, cuts, scratches, burns, soft corns, or other irritations; effective as a treatment for sore throat, canker, cold sore, mouth infection, and trench mouth; effective as a sexual disinfectant and to relieve irritation from discharge; effective as a preventive of infections resulting from handling and eating wild and domestic meats; effective as a treatment for open sores, mange, skin eruptions, distemper, vent disease, ulcer abscess, sore eyes, and ear canker; effective to prevent colds, infectious bronchitis, pneumonia or other diseases, and to destroy mites in horses, dogs, pets, and fur-bearing animals; effective as a preventive of cholera and other disease, and as a treatment for sore hoofs in hogs; effective as a treatment for open wounds, warts, contagious abortion, and retained afterbirth in cattle; effective as a sheep dip, to destroy mites, nits and scabby matter after shearing; effective as a preventive of roup, canker, pip, diphtheria, chickenpox, or other head and throat trouble, coccidiosis, blackhead in turkey, dysentery, white diarrhoea; effective to thoroughly disinfect the internal organs and to insure a healthy condition in poultry; and effective as a preventive of diseases of animals, pets, poultry, and other fowl.

On June 4, 1940, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

31131. Misbranding of Enrich Organic Iron Hematinic. U. S. v. 156 Bottles of Enrich Organic Iron Hematinic. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 44766. Sample No. 51200-D.)

This product contained insufficient iron to warrant the designation "Organic Iron Hematinic," and its labeling bore false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims.